

Medical Ethics and the Covid Pandemic. Give People “Morality Pills”

Should Individualism be Medicated Away to be Replaced by "Welfarism"? WEF: "Moral Bioenhancement" Pills to Bring Collectivist Future

By [Igor Chudov](#)

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

Global Research, November 24, 2022

[Igor's Newsletter](#) 22 November 2022

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Medical ethics is a large field of study. The Covid pandemic certainly brought many medical ethics issues to the forefront and produced rather amazing "ethicist" gems, such as this:

HEALTH

Hospitals are denying transplants for patients who aren't vaccinated against Covid, with backing from ethicists




By [Andrew Joseph](#)  Jan. 26, 2022

[Reprints](#)

Be aware that "bioethics" has moved on to proposals that might seem crazy to you but are considered seriously and published in Bill Gates-funded publications and scientific journals. Important studies on this subject are conducted under the auspices of the World Economic Forum.

[Forcibly giving people collectivism-promoting "Morality Pills"](#) ([archive link](#)) is a popular suggestion among bioethicists.

It was published in Bill Gates-funded The Conversation and is discussed widely in scientific literature. (The Conversation received 7 million dollars from Bill Gates but pretends to be an



What are these morality pills? You might think that morality, to them, means being a good husband or wife, an honest businessperson, fulfilling promises, and so on. Why not enhance that? What's the problem?

The problem is that this is NOT how they define morality! To them, morality is a collectivist mindset, lack of critical thinking, and compliance. The article explains that some people lack "moral qualities" and refuse to wear masks or take Covid vaccines, or even deny climate change:

[My research in bioethics](#) focuses on questions like how to induce those who are noncooperative to get on board with doing what's best for the public good. To me, it seems the problem of coronavirus defectors could be solved by moral enhancement: like receiving a vaccine to beef up your immune system, people could *take a substance to boost their cooperative, pro-social behavior*. Could a psychoactive pill be the solution to the pandemic?

They propose giving people pills to enhance "morality" and explain the *climate change* angle relevance:

But a strategy like this one could be a way out of this pandemic, a future outbreak or the suffering associated with climate change. That's why we should be thinking of it now.

The proposed solution to give people morality pills is more than idle thinking. Several candidate psychoactive substances are identified and considered seriously: *psilocybin* and *oxytocin*, for example.

You Would not Take Morality Pills? Administer them Secretly!

The obvious objection to all this morality pill talk is that skeptics would not take them! I would not take such a pill to enhance my collectivist mindset. At the risk of being presumptuous, I would say that *you*, my dear subscriber, would refuse them also. Right?

The ethicists have a solution: administer collectivist morality pills by force or surreptitiously.

As some have argued, a solution would be to [make moral enhancement compulsory](#) or [administer it secretly, perhaps via the water supply](#). These actions require weighing other values. Does the good of covertly dosing the public with a drug that would change people's behavior outweigh individuals' autonomy to choose whether to participate? Does the good associated with wearing a mask outweigh an individual's autonomy to not wear one?

[Serious articles](#) discuss how to do it:

Wiley Online Library

Search



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Compulsory moral bioenhancement should be covert

Parker Crutchfield✉

First published: 29 August 2018 | <https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12496> | Citations: 5

Read the full text >

PDF TOOLS SHARE

Abstract

Some theorists argue that moral bioenhancement ought to be compulsory. I take this argument one step further, arguing that *if* moral bioenhancement ought to be compulsory, then its administration ought to be covert rather than overt. This is to say that it is morally preferable for compulsory moral bioenhancement to be administered without the recipients knowing that they are receiving the enhancement. My argument for this is that if moral bioenhancement ought to be compulsory, then its administration is a matter of public health, and for this reason should be governed by public health ethics. I argue that the covert administration of a compulsory moral bioenhancement program better conforms to public health ethics than does an overt compulsory program. In particular, a covert compulsory program promotes values such as liberty, utility, equality, and autonomy better than an overt program does. Thus, a covert compulsory moral bioenhancement program is morally preferable to an overt moral bioenhancement program.

A covert psychoactive substance administration to the masses must not be discussed

publicly before its implementation, right? So the ethicists desire to bypass any democratic process or prior public discussion and scrutiny. These ethicists refuse to see an ethical problem with that!

World Economic Forum Sponsored Research into “Collectivist Bioenhancement”

Some of you, my dear readers, might think this is so batshit crazy that it is simply useless musings of fringe philosophers, not worth discussing.

Quite to the contrary, the famous and influential organization called the World Economic Forum sponsors [such bioenhancement research](#).

NIH National Library of Medicine
National Center for Biotechnology Information

PMC PubMed Central® Search PMC Full-Text Archive

Journal List > Europe PMC Author Manuscripts > PMC6420137

Europe PMC Funders Group
Author Manuscript
Accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal
SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT

Nat Hum Behav. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2019 Sep 1. PMCID: PMC6420137
Published in final edited form as: EMSID: EMS81845
Nat Hum Behav. 2019 Mar; 3(3): 204–206. PMID: 30886904
Published online 2019 Feb 11. doi: 10.1038/s41562-019-0545-2

Rethinking Human Enhancement as Collective Welfarism

Daphne Bavelier,^{1,2,*†} Julian Savulescu,^{3,4,*} Linda P. Fried,⁵ Theodore Friedmann,⁶ Corinna E. Lathan,⁷ Simone Schürle,^{8,*} and John R. Beard^{9,*}

Aunt of Sam Bankman-Fried of FTX

▶ Author information ▶ Copyright and License information Disclaimer

Linda Fried, mentioned above, is the aunt of Sam Bankman-Fried. Sam stole billions of dollars from crypto-investors (in my opinion) and used that money to become the second largest Democratic party donor. So, Linda Fried is not exactly a nobody languishing in obscurity. By the way, a friend of this blog El Gato wrote a [great post](#) discussing Sam — check it out.

Linda explains in her article that her goal is “collective welfarism,” and *she is part of the group convened by the World Economic Forum*:

Collective welfarism

Our group was convened by the World Economic Forum as a Global Futures Council (<https://www.weforum.org/communities/the-future-of-human-enhancement>) to consider this issue. We adopted the position that the goal of HETs should be to enhance quality of life and well-being, not just for individuals but also for the communities they participate in, applying principles of equity and social cohesion. This view shares many common principles with the “welfarist” approach developed by Savulescu and colleagues that the proper focus of HET is increasing well-being, taking into account the individual’s set of social and natural circumstances⁴. Here we propose to expand the welfarist approach to acknowledge the possible tension between personal and collective outcomes. Indeed, in some circumstances, the ability to enhance human function may be advantageous to the individual, yet detrimental to the community. This is exemplified by the current debates around enhancement drugs use in competitive sports or by students in university examinations.

A stronger ethical approach, though, would be to abide by the principle, termed ‘collective easy rescue’, whereby small individual losses are justified in the name of collective well-being. Mass vaccination is a well-documented example of collective easy rescue.

Human “enhancement” to force mass vaccination? Sounds familiar?

Self Absorbed Do-Gooders

Those “medical ethicists,” “world changers,” and “disinformation fighters” are so self-absorbed and self-righteous that they think their way of thinking is the only right way. They consider any deviation from their mindset to be antisocial, divisive, and subversive.

To them, freedom is dangerous. Truth is misinformation. Pursuing *personal happiness and liberty* instead of *welfarism* is selfish and immoral and needs to be dealt with through covert bioenhancement pills. Their opponents need to be silenced as “disinformation agents” or influenced via secretly applied substances to enhance compliance and lower critical thinking.

This is NOT a Conspiracy Theory!

My post, discussing outlandish agenda developed under the auspices of the World Economic Forum, may sound like the perfect conspiracy theory. If someone approached me and told me that the WEF is sponsoring “bioenhancement research,” whose goal is to develop substances to impose “collective welfarism” and achieve compliance with mass vaccination, I would not take that person seriously!

Such is the problem with describing many WEF proposals. Some of their ideas are so crazy that they are difficult to accept as genuine when retold. Official papers, proposals, peer-reviewed studies, and agenda articles describe plans that are extremely strange to the uninitiated — and yet are pursued seriously. Other authors, such as Tessa Lena, [also mentioned how difficult](#) it is to describe these tendencies.

I explained my difficulties with describing crazy but real proposals by world-leading unelected organizations such as the WEF.

Their proposals, when understood properly, are highly disturbing and seem unreal — except that they are very serious.

The difficulty with their plans is that regular people cannot believe they are real. That happens for a good reason: nobody would expect such insanity to be seriously promulgated by important men and women. Even I have difficulty reconciling the plain text and the simple meaning of their anti-human theories with my idea of what our leaders should act like.

And yet, here we are — the welfarist pills are promulgated under the auspices of the WEF by no one but Linda Fried, the aunt of the second-largest Democrat donor and crypto thief (in my opinion) Sam Bankman-Fried.

In the future, you may need to be careful with your drinking water or the compulsory mystery “health enhancement pill” you must take for an unexplained reason!

Would you take such a welfarism bioenhancement pill?

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Featured image is from Children's Health Defense

The original source of this article is [Igor's Newsletter](#)
Copyright © [Igor Chudov](#), [Igor's Newsletter](#), 2022

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Igor Chudov](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca